

T-duality in supersymmetric theory of disordered quantum systems

A. Ossipov^{1,*} and V. E. Kravtsov^{1,2}

¹*The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, P.O.B. 586, 34100 Trieste, Italy*

²*Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, 2 Kosygina st., 117940 Moscow, Russia*

A new super-symmetric representation for quantum disordered systems is derived. This representation is exact and is dual to that of the nonlinear sigma-model. The new formalism is tested by calculating the distribution of wave function amplitudes in the 1d Anderson model. The deviation from the distribution found for a thick wire is detected near the band center $E = 0$.

PACS numbers: 72.15.Rn, 72.70.+m, 72.20.Ht, 73.23.-b

Introduction.— The rigorous theory of quantum disordered systems is based almost entirely on the field-theoretical formulation of the nonlinear sigma-model (NL σ M) [1, 2]. The most successful variant of this theory, the so called *supersymmetric* (SUSY) sigma-model [2, 3], allows not only for a perturbative treatment of weak localization and mesoscopic phenomena in the delocalized (metallic) phase which was previously done by the impurity diagrammatic technique [4] but also applies to systems in the localized (insulator) phase provided that the localization radius is sufficiently large. A celebrated example is the problem of localization in a thick disordered wire [3, 5] which is equivalent [6] to the Gaussian ensemble of random banded matrices with a large bandwidth $b \gg 1$.

However, despite of the great success of the nonlinear SUSY sigma-model over the last two decades [3] this approach is limited. The limitation comes from the saddle-point approximation that locks the norm of the supermatrix field Q and thus leads to a geometric constraint $Q^2 = 1$. It is precisely the validity of this saddle-point approximation that requires a quantum system to be in the metallic phase (at least for a sufficiently small length scale), or the banded random matrices to have a large bandwidth.

The best known example for which the NL σ M is insufficient is the strictly one-dimensional disordered chain described (in the position representation) by the *three-diagonal* matrix Hamiltonian $H_{ij} = J_i \delta_{j,i\pm 1} + \varepsilon_i \delta_{ij}$. The case $J_i = 1$, and ε_i being a Gaussian random variable with zero mean and the variance $w = \langle \varepsilon_i^2 \rangle$ is known as the 1d Anderson model. Its continuous counterpart for a weak disorder $w \ll 1$ was studied in detail in the 70-th [7, 8, 9] with the classic results on the frequency dependent conductivity [7, 10] and dc conductance distribution [8, 9]. The special case where $\varepsilon_i = 0$ and J_i is a Gaussian random variable has been studied in the pioneer work by Dyson [11] and attracted a lot of interest in recent years in connection with the new symmetry classes [12]. Yet another broad class of systems which cannot be studied by the NL σ M are systems described by the *almost diagonal* random matrix Hamiltonian [13] with the variance of the diagonal entries $\langle H_{ii}^2 \rangle$ much larger than that for

the off-diagonal ones $\langle |H_{i \neq j}|^2 \rangle$. Some of such systems with $\langle |H_{i \neq j}|^2 \rangle \sim |i - j|^{-2}$ attracted recently much attention in connection with the multifractality of the critical eigenstates [13, 14, 15].

The main goal of this work is to fill in the gap in our technical ability to apply the SUSY method to quantum disordered systems. Below we present a field-theoretical description that is free of of the saddle-point approximation and thus applies to all the above cases which are not amenable to the conventional NL σ M. This description keeps all the Grassmann variables and thus is different from another suggestion, the *super-bosonization*, which was recently proposed in Ref. [16] as an exact method instead of the NL σ M but is suffering from uncertainties and incomplete definition of the target space. The method we are proposing is similar in spirit to that of Ref.[16] but has an advantage to be as close as possible to the standard SUSY NL σ M. In particular, the new supermatrix field $\hat{Q}$ can be diagonalized by a pseudo-unitary transformation with separated Grassmann and commuting variables [3] similar to the one used in the NL σ M. This allows to drastically simplify calculations with the final result depending on few commuting variables only, as for the conventional NL σ M.

The main property of the new description is that it is *dual* to the old one: the coupling matrix of the new theory is just the inverse of the coupling matrix of the NL σ M. However, the space of the matrices $\hat{Q}$ of the new theory (the $\hat{Q}$ target space) is different from the Q target space of the NL σ M. So, we are dealing not with the conventional duality but with a kind of *T-duality* [17] remotely resembling the situation in the string theory.

As an illustration of the new formalism at work we consider the problem of the eigenfunction statistics for a one-dimensional Anderson model. We derive the transfer matrix integral recursive equation following the same rout as the one used in the framework of the SUSY nonlinear sigma-model for quasi-1d disordered wires [3] or banded random matrices [6]. For weak disorder this integral equation reduces to the the differential equation of exactly the same form as for a thick disordered wire. This fact (noticed earlier in [3, 5]) implies that despite the absence of the diffusive regime in a strictly 1d chain, the

smooth envelope of a wavefunction at scales much larger than the wavelength and the wire cross-section has exactly the same statistics in a thick disordered wire and in a strictly 1d disordered chain.

The dual representation.—For concreteness we consider the matrix Hamiltonian of the unitary class $\mathbf{H}$ which entries H_{ij} are random independent Gaussian variables characterizing by the variance matrix $\mathbf{g}_{ij} = \langle |H_{ij}|^2 \rangle$ and the mean values $\langle H_{ij} \rangle = H_{ij}^{(0)}$. The standard SUSY field-theoretical description [3] aimed to computing the retarded/advanced (R/A) Green's functions $[E_{\pm} - \mathbf{H}]^{-1}$ begins with introducing the Ψ functional $S = \sum_{ij} \bar{\Psi}_i (E_{\pm} \delta_{ij} - H_{ij}) \Psi_j$, where $E_{\pm} = E \pm \tilde{\omega}/2$ and $\tilde{\omega} = \omega + 2i\eta$ with $\eta \rightarrow +0$. The *ket*-supervector $\Psi = (S_R, S_A, \mu_R, \mu_A)^T$ contains both commuting complex variables $S_{R/A}$ and Grassmann anti-commuting variables $\mu_{R/A}$. For convergence of the Gaussian functional integrals containing $e^{iS[\Psi]}$ the *bra*-supervector $\bar{\Psi}$ is given by $\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger \Lambda$ where $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{1, -1, 1, -1\}$. The SUSY trick allows to do averaging over disorder prior to doing the functional integral over Ψ . Thus we obtain $\langle e^{iS[\Psi]} \rangle = e^{-F}$, where

$$F = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{g}_{ij} \text{Str}[\hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j] - \frac{i\tilde{\omega}}{2} \sum_i \text{Str}[\Lambda \hat{Q}_i] \quad (1)$$

$$- iE \sum_i \text{Str}[\hat{Q}_i] + F_{kin}.$$

Here $F_{kin} = i \sum_{ij} \bar{\Psi}_i H_{ij}^{(0)} \Psi_j$ and

$$\hat{Q} = \Psi \otimes \bar{\Psi} = \Psi \otimes \Psi^\dagger \Lambda. \quad (2)$$

So far we did not deviate from the standard rout except for introducing the new notations Eq.(2). However, the integration measure is still unchanged $d\mu[\Psi] = dS_R dS_A dS_R^* dS_A^* d\mu_R d\mu_A d\mu_R^* d\mu_A^*$.

Now we do the crucial step. Instead of performing the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation which decouples the quartic in Ψ term in Eq.(1) by the supermatrix Q and applying the subsequent saddle point approximation which leads to the sigma-model constraint $Q^2 = 1$ we change the variables so that in the new variables the supermatrix $\hat{Q}$ is parameterized similar to the supermatrix Q of the sigma-model:

$$S_{R/A} = \pm i \sqrt{\lambda_{1/2}} e^{\pm i\varphi/2 + i\Omega} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \chi_{R/A}^* \chi_{R/A}\right) \quad (3)$$

$$\mu_{R/A} = \pm i \sqrt{\lambda_{1/2}} e^{\pm i\varphi/2 + i\Omega} \chi_{R/A},$$

where $\lambda_{1/2} \geq 0$, $0 \leq \varphi \leq 2\pi$, $0 \leq \Omega \leq \pi$ and $\chi_{R/A}, \chi_{R/A}^*$ are the new Grassmann variables.

One can check that in new variables the supermatrix $\hat{Q}$ defined in Eq.(2) can be represented in the form where Grassmann and commuting variables are separated by factorization:

$$\hat{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} u_R & 0 \\ 0 & u_A \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{D}_{RR} & \hat{D}_{RA} \\ \hat{D}_{AR} & \hat{D}_{AA} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_R^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & u_A^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

The factorization Eq.(4) is also one of the basic properties of the Efetov's parameterization in the sigma-model [3]. Moreover, the corresponding matrices $u_{R/A}$ are essentially the same:

$$u_{R/A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{1}{2} \chi_{R/A}^* \chi_{R/A} & -\chi_{R/A}^* \\ \chi_{R/A} & 1 + \frac{1}{2} \chi_{R/A}^* \chi_{R/A} \end{pmatrix}_{BF}. \quad (5)$$

The difference is in the form of the matrix $\hat{D}$. Like in the case of Efetov's parameterization it is diagonal in the boson-fermion (BF) space. However, in contrast to the sigma-model *only* the bosonic sector is nonzero:

$$\hat{D}_{BB} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} e^{i\varphi} \\ -\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} e^{-i\varphi} & -\lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}_{RA}, \quad \hat{D}_{FF} = 0. \quad (6)$$

One can see that the matrix $\hat{D}_{BB}$ can be diagonalized by the same *pseudo-unitary* transformation as the matrix D_{BB} of the sigma-model: $\hat{D}_{BB} = \hat{T} \hat{B}_0 \hat{T}^{-1}$, where $\hat{T} \in U(1,1)$. However, the diagonal matrix $\hat{B}_0 = |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \text{diag}(\theta(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2), \theta(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1))_{RA}$ is different from the corresponding diagonal matrix Λ_{BB} of the sigma-model and contains a new degree of freedom, the difference $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. This means that the full symmetry of the target space is $\frac{U(1,1)}{U(1) \times U(1)} \times \mathbb{R}$ rather than $\frac{U(1,1)}{U(1) \times U(1)} \times \frac{U(2)}{U(1) \times U(1)}$ as for the sigma-model.

To complete the procedure of changing variables from Ψ to $\hat{Q}$ we have to compute the Jacobian of the transformation Eq.(3) and rewrite F_{kin} in Eq.(1) in terms of $\hat{Q}$. The first task is straightforward and the result is:

$$d\mu \equiv d\hat{Q} d\Omega = d\chi_R d\chi_R^* d\chi_A d\chi_A^* d\varphi d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \frac{d\Omega}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}. \quad (7)$$

To accomplish the second one we note that $\bar{\Psi}_i = \bar{\varphi}_i e^{-i\Omega_i}$ and $\Psi_j = \varphi_j e^{i\Omega_j}$ where $\varphi_i = \Psi_i|_{\Omega_i=0}$. Then each link $\{ij\}$ enters in the last term of Eq.(1) as $iV_{ij} = i(p_{ij} e^{-i\Omega_{ij}} + p_{ji} e^{i\Omega_{ij}})$, where $p_{ij} = \bar{\varphi}_i \varphi_j H_{ij}^{(0)}$, and $\Omega_{ij} = \Omega_i - \Omega_j$. Then assuming that the observable of interest is gauge-invariant and thus independent of Ω and integrating $e^{-i \sum_{ij} V_{ij}}$ over all $\Omega_{ij} \in [-\pi, \pi]$ one obtains for the last term in Eq.(1):

$$F_{kin} = - \sum_{j>i} \ln \left\{ 2\pi J_0 \left(2\sqrt{|H_{ij}^{(0)}|^2 \text{Str}[\hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j]} \right) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Note, however, that in order to arrive at Eq.(8) integration over *all* Ω_{ij} should be independent. This is the case when the links provided by $H_{ij}^{(0)}$ form a lattice with *no loops*. The simplest example considered below is a one-dimensional lattice with only nearest neighbor connections $H_{i,i\pm 1}^{(0)}$.

The new supermatrix field theory given by Eqs.(1),(8) together with the parameterization of the supermatrix $\hat{Q}$, Eqs.(4)-(6) is the main result of the paper. It has to

be compared with the standard supermatrix sigma-model [3]. In the case $\langle H_{ij} \rangle = 0$ and $\mathbf{g}_{ij} = \mathbf{g}(|i-j|)$ the action reads [6]:

$$F_{sm} = -\frac{(\pi\nu A_0)^2}{2} \sum_{ij} \mathbf{g}_{ij}^{-1} \text{Str}[Q_i Q_j] - \frac{i\pi\nu \tilde{\omega}}{2} \sum_i \text{Str}[\Lambda Q_i], \quad (9)$$

where $\nu(E) = \frac{1}{4\pi A_0} \sqrt{8A_0 - E^2}$ is the mean density of states and $A_0 = \sum_i \mathbf{g}_{ij}$. Comparing Eq.(9) with Eq.(1) one notices that the coupling matrix $\mathbf{g}$ in Eq.(1) is replaced in Eq.(9) by the *inverse* coupling matrix $\mathbf{g}^{-1}$. That is why the new representation is *dual* to the standard sigma-model representation. However the target spaces of the supermatrices $\hat{Q}$ and Q in Eq.(1) and Eq.(9) are different. The Q -field is constrained: $Q^2 = 1$ and $\text{Str } Q = 0$. That is why the term $E \text{Str } Q$ cannot arise and the energy E enters as an inessential parameter. There is no such constraints for the supermatrix $\hat{Q}$ in Eq.(1) and the terms $E \text{Str } \hat{Q}$ and $\mathbf{g}_{ii} \text{Str } \hat{Q}_i^2$ are important. In particular this leads to peculiar properties of the 1d disordered chain at the point $E = 0$ [19, 20], especially in the *chiral* case [11] where diagonal matrix elements (on-site energies) H_{ii} do not fluctuate.

1d Anderson model.—We illustrate the new method by considering the statistics of an eigenfunction $\psi_n(i)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue E_n for the 1d Anderson model. This problem has been studied earlier [18] by a different method which was not based on the SUSY trick. The 1d Anderson model corresponds to the field theory Eqs.(1),(8) where the coupling matrix $\mathbf{g}_{ij} = w \delta_{ij}$ is diagonal and $H_{ij}^{(0)} = \delta_{i,j+1} + \delta_{i,j-1}$. To compute the distribution function $P_i(t) = \nu^{-1}(E) \langle \sum_n \delta(t - |\psi_n(i)|^2) \delta(E_n - E) \rangle$ we follow the procedure used in [3, 5] for thick quasi-1d wires where the sigma-model applies. It starts by the exact expression for the q -th moment of this distribution

$$I_q(i) = \frac{1}{4\pi\nu(E)} \frac{1}{(q-2)!} \int_0^\infty ds s^{q-2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv Y_i(s, v). \quad (10)$$

in terms of the function $Y(\hat{Q}_i) = \int \prod_{\ell \neq i} d\hat{Q}_\ell e^{-F(\hat{Q})}$. The functional F is given by Eq.(1), where $\tilde{\omega} = 2\eta \rightarrow +0$ and $F_{kin} = \sum_i F_{kin}(\hat{Q}_i, \hat{Q}_{i+1}) = -\sum_i \ln 2\pi J_0(2\sqrt{\text{Str } \hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_{i+1}})$.

As usual [5] in the 1d chain of the length N the function $Y_i = W_i W_{N-i} e^{-L(\hat{Q}_i)}$ is found from the recursive relation:

$$W_{j+1}(\hat{Q}) = \int d\mu(\hat{Q}') e^{-F_{kin}(\hat{Q}, \hat{Q}') - L(\hat{Q}')} W_j(\hat{Q}'), \quad (11)$$

where $L(\hat{Q}) = \frac{w}{2} \text{Str } \hat{Q}^2 + \text{Str } \Lambda \hat{Q} - iE \text{Str } \hat{Q}$, and the boundary condition $W_{j=1}(\hat{Q}) = 1$ is assumed.

One can show that the integral in Eq.(11) does not depend on the Grassmann variables χ and on the angle φ . Thus W_i and Y_i are functions of two (λ_1, λ_2) of the

seven variables only. This property is based on the form of the parameterization Eqs.(4)-(6) and similar to that known in the sigma-model approach [3, 5, 21], where the corresponding functions depend on the non-compact λ_B and the compact λ_F angles only. In the limit $\eta \rightarrow +0$, W_i remains a function of *two* new variables $v = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ and $s = \eta(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$. At this point the difference in the symmetries of the target spaces in our approach and the sigma-model becomes important. In the latter case W_i depends on one rescaled variable $(2\eta) \lambda_B$ only, while the dependence on λ_F disappears [3, 5, 21]. The fact that the recursive relation Eq.(11) and the Fokker-Plank equation that follows from it depend on *two* variables is generic to all methods in the theory of 1d disordered chains [22] thus demonstrating that the SUSY approach is the *minimal* description. We will see that the dependence on v reflects statistics of eigenfunction oscillations at scales of the order of the de Broglie wavelength k_F^{-1} which are essentially different in a thick wire and in a 1d chain.

After integration over the angle φ' and over the Grassmann variables according to a convention $\int \chi'_{R/A} d\chi'_{R/A} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ and going to the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ one obtains an exact recursive equation:

$$W_{j+1}(s, v) = \frac{s^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv' \int_0^\infty \frac{ds'}{(s')^{\frac{3}{2}}} W_j(s', v') \quad (12)$$

$$\times \cos \left[\sqrt{ss'} \left(\frac{v'}{s'} + \frac{v}{s} \right) \right] e^{-s' - \frac{w}{2} v'^2 + iEv'}.$$

Similar equations have been derived earlier [23, 24] in study of the localization transition on the Bethe lattice. Eq.(12) is valid for any strength of disorder w and for an arbitrary energy E . However in the limit of weak disorder $w \ll 1$ it can be drastically simplified using the *scale separation* $k_F^{-1} \ll \xi_{loc}$ where ξ_{loc} is the localization length. To this end we first consider the disorder-free case. Setting $w = 0$ in Eq.(12) one notices that the Fourier-transform $\tilde{W}_j(s', q') = \int dv' W_j(s', v') e^{iv'q'}$ naturally arises. Remarkably, the equation for $\tilde{W}_j(s, q)$ turns out to be an *algebraic* and not an integral equation: $\tilde{W}_{j+1}(s, q) = \frac{1}{q^2} e^{-sq^2} \tilde{W}_j(sq^2, E - \frac{1}{q})$. This functional equation can be simplified if we introduce new variables $s = z \cos^2(\phi/2 + k)$ and $q = \cos(\phi/2)/\cos(\phi/2 + k)$ and a new function:

$$\Phi_j(z, \phi) = \tilde{W}_j(s(z, \phi), q(z, \phi)) \frac{\sin k}{2 \cos^2(\phi/2 + k)}, \quad (13)$$

where k defined by the relation $E = 2 \cos k$ is a momentum for plane waves in the tight-binding model.

In new variables we obtain:

$$\Phi_{j+1}(z, \phi) = e^{-z \cos^2(\phi/2)} \Phi_j(z, \phi - 2k). \quad (14)$$

One can see that the variable $\phi/2$ is related with the phase of the wave function as it changes by k in passing

from a lattice site j to the neighboring one. For an irrational k/π as one moves along the chain at a distance $\xi_{loc} \gg 1$, the phase ϕ sweeps with the constant density through the entire interval $[0, 2\pi]$. Therefore ϕ is the true "fast" variable [22] in contrast to the "slow" variable z . Thus one comes to an idea [22] of *averaging* over ϕ and replacing $\Phi_j(z, \phi)$ in Eq.(13) by its average (the "fast phase" ansatz): $\Phi_j(z) \equiv \overline{\Phi_j(z, \phi)} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \Phi_j(z, \phi)$.

Now we take into account weak disorder by expanding $e^{-\frac{w}{2}v'^2} = 1 - \frac{w}{2}v'^2 = 1 + \frac{w}{2}\partial^2/\partial q'^2$ in Eq.(12). We also assume $z \sim w \ll 1$ and expand $e^{-z \cos^2(\phi/2)} \approx 1 - z \cos^2(\phi/2)$. Then doing the Fourier transform over v and v' , switching to the new variables z, ϕ and averaging over ϕ one obtains for $\Phi_{j+1}(z) - \Phi_j(z) = c_1 z \Phi_j(z) + c_2 z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \Phi_j}{\partial z^2} + c_3 \left(\Phi_j - z \frac{\partial \Phi_j}{\partial z} \right)$, where $c_1 = -\overline{\cos^2(\phi/2)} = -1/2$, $c_2 = \frac{w}{\sin^2 k} \overline{(1 - \cos^2 \phi)} = \frac{w}{2 \sin^2 k}$, and $c_3 = \frac{w}{\sin^2 k} \overline{(1 + \cos \phi)(1 - 2 \cos \phi)} = 0$. Then switching to the continuous spacial variable $\tau = j/\xi_{loc}$ with $\xi_{loc} = \frac{2 \sin^2 k}{w}$ and the variable $x = z \xi_{loc}/2$ we obtain the following Fokker-Plank equation subject to the boundary condition $\Phi_{\tau=0}(x) = 1$:

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_\tau(x)}{\partial \tau} = \left(x^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - x \right) \Phi_\tau(x). \quad (15)$$

The fact that $c_3 = 0$ depends crucially on the assumption on the homogeneous distribution of the fast phase ϕ which is related with the single-parameter scaling. As a matter of fact the distribution of phases $F(\phi; E/w)$ depends on energy and is homogeneous $F(\phi; \infty) = \frac{1}{2\pi}$ only for irrational k away from the band center $E = 0$. At the band center $F(\phi; 0) \propto (3 + \cos \phi)^{-1/2}$ is different [25] and we obtain $c_1 = 1 - 2E/K \approx -0.457$, $c_2 \frac{\sin^2 k}{w} = (-16/3 + 8E/K) \approx 0.494$ and $c_3 \frac{\sin^2 k}{w} = (-26/3 + 12E/K) \approx 0.075$, where $E = E(1/2)$ and $K = K(1/2)$ are elliptic integrals. Thus at the band center $|E| \ll w$ Eq.(15) should be modified by including the combination $\Phi - x \partial \Phi / \partial x$ proportional to c_3 .

Finally we have to switch to new variables in Eq.(10) which involves the combination $\tilde{W}_i(s, q) \tilde{W}_{N-i}(s, E - q)$. After replacing $\tilde{W}$ by Φ according to Eq.(13), using the fast phase ansatz $\Phi_j(z, \phi) \rightarrow \Phi_\tau(x)$ and integrating over ϕ one obtains for $|E| \gg w$:

$$I_q(\tau) = \frac{(2q-1)!!}{(q!)^2} \int_0^\infty dy q(q-1) y^{q-2} Y_\tau(\xi_{loc} y), \quad (16)$$

where we used the relation $2\pi\nu(E) = dk/dE = 1/(2 \sin k)$ and the definition $Y_\tau(x) = \Phi_\tau(x) \Phi_{\frac{N}{\xi_{loc}} - \tau}(x)$. The result given by Eqs.(15),(16) is in a perfect agreement with the one obtained in Ref.[18] by a completely different method.

Remarkably, the integral in Eq.(16) and the Fokker-Plank equation Eq.(15) coincide completely [5] with the

corresponding equations [3, 5] determining statistics of wave functions for a *multi-channel* disordered wire. The q -dependent factor in front of the integral in Eq.(16) is due to the difference in statistics of oscillations of almost ballistic (in a strictly 1d system) and fully chaotic (in a thick wire) wave functions at a small scale of the order of the de Broglie wavelength. This coincidence is a manifestation of the single-parameter scaling and it breaks down near the band center $|E| \ll w$.

* Electronic address: aossipov@ictt.trieste.it

- [1] F. Wegner, Z. Phys **35**, 207 (1979).
- [2] K. B. Efetov, Adv. Phys. **32**, 53 (1983).
- [3] K. B. Efetov, Supersymmetry in Chaos and Disorder, (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- [4] L. P. Gorkov, A. I. Larkin, and D. E. Khmel'nitskii, Pis'ma v Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **30**, 248 (1979) [JETP Letters **30** 228 (1979)].
- [5] A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rep. **326**, 259 (2000).
- [6] Y. V. Fyodorov and A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2405 (1991).
- [7] V. L. Berezinskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **65**, 1251 (1973) [Sov. Phys. JETP **38**, 620 (1974)].
- [8] A. A. Abrikosov and I. A. Ryzhkin, Adv. Phys. **27**, 147 (1978).
- [9] V. I. Melnikov, JETP Letters **32**, 225 (1980).
- [10] N. F. Mott, Adv. Phys. **16**, 49 (1967).
- [11] F. J. Dyson, Phys. Rev. **92**, 1331 (1958).
- [12] M. R. Zirnbauer, J. Math. Phys. **37**, 4986 (1996); A. Altland and M. R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 1142 (1997).
- [13] O. M. Yevtushenko and V. E. Kravtsov, J. Phys. A **36**, 8265 (2003).
- [14] A. D. Mirlin et al. Phys. Rev. E **54**, 3221 (1996).
- [15] V. E. Kravtsov and K. A. Muttalib, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1913 (1997).
- [16] K. B. Efetov, G. Schwiete, and K. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 026807 (2004).
- [17] J. Polchinski, String Theory, v.I, (Cambridge University Press, 1998), p.231.
- [18] I. V. Kolokolov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **103**, 2196 (1993) [Sov. Phys. JETP **76**, 1099 (1993)].
- [19] H. Schomerus and M. Titov, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 100201(R) (2003).
- [20] L. I. Deych, M. V. Erementchouk, A. A. Lisiansky, and B. L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 096601 (2003).
- [21] M. R. Zirnbauer, Nucl. Phys. B **265**, 375 (1986).
- [22] I. M. Lifshits, S. A. Gredeskul, L. A. Pastur, *Introduction to the theory of disordered systems*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1988, p.147.
- [23] A. D. Mirlin and Y. V. Fyodorov, Nucl. Phys. B **366**, 507 (1991).
- [24] R. Abou-Chacra, P. W. Anderson, and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **6**, 1734 (1973).
- [25] A. Ossipov, T. Kottos, and T. Geisel, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 11411 (2000).